DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 376 HE 001 329

AUTHOR	Leigh, Terry
TITLE	A Selected and Annotated Bibliography on Evaluating Performance of College Faculty Members.
INSTITUTION	Kentucky Univ., Lexington.
REPORT NO	Occas-pap-8
PUB DATE	[69]
NOTE	30p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Program on Educational Change, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506. Single copies free
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Annotated Bibliographies, College Administration, Criteria, *Evaluation, *Faculty, *Higher Education, Methodology, Performance, Problems, Students, *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography contains 56 entries concerned with college faculty evaluation. The entries deal mostly with the methods, procedures, and problems involved in faculty evaluation by students, administrators, and peers. Several are concerned with the "teaching or research" question in relation to evaluation. Most are taken from journals and periodicals with a substantial number from the journal, "Improving Colleges and University Teaching". The items were published from 1961 to 1968, although most appeared from 1966 to 1968. (DS)

ED035376

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 8

A SELECTED AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS

by

Mr. Terry Leigh

University of Kentucky

HE 001 329

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED035376

INTRODUCTION

This is Occasional Paper No. 8. There are seven others that have been completed:

Occasional Paper No. 1: A System Analysis of Education in Kentucky Public Schools. Richard I. Miller

Occasional Paper No. 2: School Reorganization and the Process of Educational Change. Richard I. Miller

Occasional Paper No. 3: Relationships Between Innovation and Selected School Factors. William N. Pafford

Occasional Paper No. 4: Education and Preparation for the 21st Century. Richard I. Miller

Occasional Paper No. 5: An Overview of ESEA Title III. Richard I. Miller

Occasional Paper No. 6: Directions and Processes of Educational Change in Higher Education. Richard I. Miller

Occasional Paper No. 7: The Technical Advisor As a Cross-Cultural Change Agent. Leo J. Juarez

These papers are available free of charge, in single copies.

They are provided as a service of the Program on Educational Change.

Richard I. Miller
Director, Program on
Educational Change
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Anderson, C. C., and Hunka, S. M. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal." Harvard Educational Review, pp. 74-95. (Volume and date unknown. Unbound material obtained from Dr. R. I. Miller, University of Kentucky.)

The article states that pupils, evaluators, and administrators consider quite different attributes in conceptualizing the competent teacher. A step toward better understanding of the problems relating to teacher competency may be the intensive and extensive study of teacher characteristics. Some of these may be spontaniety, initiative, voluntary social contributions, acts of problem solving, and signficantly fewer attributes such as conflict with others and boredom.

Astin, Alexander W., and Lee, Calvin B. T. "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers." The Educational Record, 47 (Summer, 1966), pp. 361-375.

The American Council on Education surveyed the entire population of higher education institutions in the United States. The number of usable questionnaires returned was 1,110. The purpose of the survey was to provide an empirical basis for a critical appraisal of current practices and to determine a point of departure from which proposals for improving existing techniques could be developed.

The questionnaire, sent to each undergraduate academic dean, was designed to obtain information concerning the frequency with which various sources of information are used in judging a professor's teaching ability, techniques for training new college teachers, and the importance of classroom teaching relative to other factors of overall evaluation of faculty members for promotions, salary increases, or tenure. For the first two factors a four-point scale consisting of "all or most departments," "some," "few," and "not used" was devised. The third factor was rated on a three-point scale.

The scale consisted of "major," "minor factor," or "not used," plus a "non-applicable" alternative.

The most frequently used of 15 sources of information for determining teaching effectiveness are evaluations by department chairman (85.1 percent responded used in all or most departments), and evaluations by the dean (82.3 percent). Next in order came the opinions of colleagues (48.9 percent), scholarly research and publications (43.8 percent), and informal student opinions (41.2 percent). Classroom visits are used very infrequently (taboo at 39.5 percent of the institutions); evaluations must be based on hearsay evidence--informal student opinions. The data clearly indicates that research and publication are the primary considerations in evaluating his teaching ability.

University colleges of arts and sciences use informal student opinion only one-half as frequently as they use research and publication, whereas liberal arts colleges reverse the procedure. Junio: colleges and teachers' colleges use more direct observation than other institutions.

Criteria considered by all institutions as a major factor for salary increase, promotion, and tenure were: (1) Classroom teaching--95.9 percent, (2) Personal attributes--56.8 percent, (3) Length of service in rank--47.4 percent, (4) Research--46.6 percent. At university colleges research is almost equal in consideration to teaching. More selective and affluent colleges are more likely to use research and publication as criteria. This is also true with larger institutions.

Of the formal methods used for training newly hired faculty, very little is offered beyond preregistration orientation sessions.

Outstanding teacher awards are presented by 36.1 percent of the institutions. However, the manner of selection is extremely varied. Most of the institutions use student opinion.

Bayley, David H. "Making College Teaching a Profession." Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Spring, 1967), pp. 115-119.

The author discusses the fact that most college teachers believe that they are fully capable of criticizing their own teaching performance. However, the present system indicates that the

word of each teacher individually can hardly be accepted at face value. The author sees two alternatives--students and other observers. By and large teachers reject student evaluations. Therefore, the only way to judge the worth of student opinions is to set it along side of qualified observers--other college teachers. Colleague evaluation will provide trustworthy criticism and an essential element of feedback, agreement as to teaching performance, and information for rewarding and punishing teachers.

Belknap, Edward H., et al. "Guidelines for Promotion." Improving College and University Teaching, XIII (Winter, 1965), pp. 14-15.

Recommendations by the Division of Education Personnel Committee at San Fernando State College on policies to be followed in relation to hiring, orientation, and promotion of staff members were based on the assumption that faculty promotions are made on the basis of personal judgements. These judgements, then, must be distilled from the largest source of information available to the judges, and that information be sought from all of those who are in a position to know. Information was grouped into three areas: (1) Good teaching at the college level, (2) Contribution to division and college, and (3) Professional growth.

Birnbaum, Robert. "Background and Evaluation of Faculty in New York." The Junior College Journal XXXVIII (November, 1966), pp. 34-37.

Twenty-seven of the thirty-four public, two-year colleges in New York State were surveyed. Twelve factors as criteria for promotion and tenure were presented to the president or dean for rating on a five-point basis with one being extremely important and five of no importance at all. The factors ranking one and two were teaching performance and effectiveness, and academic preparation and continuing education. Factors ranking eleven and twelve were community service and scholarly research and publications, respectively. Of the methods for evaluating teaching effectiveness, the factors ranked one and two involved ratings by administrators. The four methods that were most often rated high but were not utilized were student ratings, class visits by dean or department chairman, student follow-ups, and course syllabi and examinations.

Blackman, A. F., et al. "Students Rate Their Professors and Courses." Phi Delta Kappan 48 (February, 1967), pp. 266-269.

The authors undertook the production of a booklet in which professors and students would discuss their courses. Student opinion was

solicited by questionnaire, and a summary of the course was written. The professor was then forwarded the summary and invited to reply. The professor's reply was printed along with the summary in the booklet. The objectives of the publications were: (1) To inform students about their prospective courses, (2) To provide professors with feedback about their teaching, and (3) To influence academic policy or effect changes in the teaching of courses. Eighty percent of the professors replied to the summaries. A thirty percent student response was needed for a summary to be written.

Bogue, E. G. "Student Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness in Higher Education; Summary of the Literature." Educational Quest XI (Fall, 1967), pp. 6-10.

The article states that there has been a lack of scientific basis for the educational practice of evaluation. The article contributes various opinions that there is a need for the utilization of student opinions in the evaluative process. Evaluation does not eliminate the need for value judgement.

Bourgeois, Don Paul. "A Study of Faculty Opinion Concerning Selected Factors Related to Excellence in Teaching at the University of Southwestern Louisiana." Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, University of Southwestern Louisiana, August, 1967.

The purpose of the paper was to solicit faculty opinion as to undergraduate program accreditation, benefits derived from educational courses that deal with teacher preparation, promotion policy, and views of the faculty concerning student evaluation. An examination of the literature pertaining to the study indicated that: (1) The Ph. D. does not indicate that a good teacher is produced, (2) The Ph. D. prepares the recipient as a researcher and not a teacher, (3) Only one-half of all that earn a doctorate find their way into teaching. (4) The present graduate colleges train researchers and not teachers, (5) Only ten percent of the faculty accounts for ninety percent of the research and publication in any university, (6) In any given year, no more than thirty percent of an average university faculty will be engaged in research.

Analysis of questionnaires indicated that there was a lack of qualified faculty members if the proper credential for college teaching is the doctorate. A small percentage of the faculty members had the prescribed professional educational courses required for good college teaching. Many faculty statements indicate that the faculty was unfamiliar with the policy for promotions at the university. The faculty perceived the students as having some ability to evaluate

excellence in teaching, and some benefits could accrue from observation of such a practice.

Brown, Don W. "Teach Or Perish." Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Spring, 1967), pp. 108-110.

Five elements are listed that must be included in over-all evaluation. These five C's of evaluation require that the enterprise be cooperative, comprehensive, constructive, clinical, and continuous. Colleague evaluation should possess about 60%-75% of the final decision. A realistic system of rewards must be provided. Competent analytical study should determine judgement. Evaluation should be thorough and continuous.

Bryant, Paul T. "By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them." The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (June, 1967), pp. 326-330.

The author states that university administrators agree that effective teaching, not research, should head the list of considerations for rewards. Three main ways of recognizing and rewarding good teaching are discussed. Student evaluation is considered by the author to be invalid due to immaturity, elective versus required courses, and class size. Administrative evaluation could be worthwhile, yet it is seldom conducted. Peer evaluation is best conducted by a department chairman or his delegate through visitation, discussion, and examination of course materials and examinations.

Byrnes, Francis C., and Jamrich, John X. "Survey of Policies and Practices Relating to Improved Instruction." Improvement of Instruction in Higher Education. Report to The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1962, pp. 19-22.

The survey was designed to elicit information from the official AACTE representative in each member institution regarding institutional policies and practices relating to instruction. Analysis of the 310 questionnaires returned indicated that promotion in rank and salary increases are the two reward practices most frequently mentioned. Outstanding teaching alone may serve as a basis for promotion in rank in 51.9% of the institutions, while 86.5% indicate salary increases may be made on this basis. The appraisal and evaluation technique used in assessing teaching ability for promotion or salary increases is information gathered via "the grapevine," this by 63.2% of the institutions. Administration observance is reported by 45.5%, with this being least characteristic of universities with enrolments exceeding 25,000. While only 45.5% of the institutions reporting utilize observation by administrators,

88.1% indicate that the administrators are the persons who evaluate teaching for purposes of salary increases and promotion. Peer group appraisal, student achievement, and student rating systems were also discussed.

Cohen, Shoshana. "Evaluation of Teachers." Journal of Dental Education, 30, 1967, pp. 225-228.

The article states that teachers are presently evaluated for two main purposes--recruitment and promotion. Recruitment factors usually have little bearing on teaching competence. Promotion often depends upon how well the candidate is liked. Deans and department heads are generally responsible for evaluation. Student results have been surprisingly good. The main emphasis is on a person's ability to do research. Future suggestions may include classifying teachers into categories such as seminar leader, lecturer-teacher, clinical teacher, laboratory teacher, etc. Additional methods to be utilized could include skill in lecturing, use of teaching aids, testing, and evaluating student performance. Benefits of objective teacher evaluation include teacher recognition, enhancement of student learning, and security for teacher and student.

de Brium, Hendrick C. "Quality Instruction." Improving College and University Teaching, XV, (Autumn, 1967), pp. 214-215.

Explains a rating instrument developed in an attempt to isolate certain characteristics of good teaching. It was hypothesized that these characteristics are in the realm of self-concept and personality. Graduate students were asked to rate the instructors' over-all ability, and then check any of the ten factors under the "observed instructor self-concept" that they felt were evident. This instrument will aid an administrator or department chairman in determining whether the instructor is a helper of students or a dictator of facts.

Dressel, Paul L. "Evaluation of Instruction." Journal of Farm Economics, 49, (February, 1967), pp. 299-314.

Extensive research has been conducted in the area of student perception. Student ratings have been found to be fairly consistent, regardless of grade or class level of the student. Yet due to instructor displeasure with the process it may be more realistic to have the students engage in a broader type of evaluation in reference to the course or the total learning experience. Observation by peers or by administrative superiors is regularly

practiced by some and probably should be more commonly the pattern. The prevailing tradition of academic freedom has made it difficult to initiate methods as classroom recordings and similar devices. Evaluation of instruction would be primarily oriented to improvement. Evaluation for purposes of reward, all too likely results in teacher defensiveness rather than a serious attempt to improve. Improvement or reward cannot proceed without the other. Good instruction depends upon curriculum organization and the facilities available. It depends upon objectives, upon methods and materials, and upon how these are organized and interrelated.

_____. "Teaching, Learning and Evaluation." College and University Teaching. Edited by H. A. Estrin and D. M. Goode. Dubuque, Iowa: William Brown Company, 1964.

States that evaluation is inseparable from instruction in learning. The implicit and explicit objectives must coincide to allow for meaningful objectives. Rational determination of objectives requires consideration of change in amount and direction. Evaluation all too often emphasizes errors and ignores strengths. Instruction requires making provision for the student to practice behavior stated by our objectives. Student reactions are but indirect evidence of effectiveness, but should recognize shared responsibility for effectiveness, of course. Evaluation should be learned experience for both teacher and student.

Fishman, Joshua. "Cross-Cultural Perspective on the Evaluation of Guided Behavioral Change." The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D. C.: Pi Lambda Theta, 1967, pp. 9-31.

A position paper associated with the 2nd Pi Lambda Theta Catena. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the United States has concentrated most on teacher characteristics and behavior. While it is clear that the teacher and the method he or she uses are important to the learning process, we cannot yet say just what it is that the effective teacher is or does. Teaching cannot be evaluated independently of learning, nor can learning be evaluated independently of teaching. American teachers need to be much more personally accepting of evaluation than they now are.

Gage, N. L. "The Appraisal of College Teaching." Journal of Higher Education, 32, (January, 1961), pp. 17-22.

The appraisal must be fair. The teachers must not be penalized because of conditions over which they have no control, such as the level of the course, the size of the class, whether the course is elective or required, and where it is taught. Research conducted at the University of Illinois indicated that: (1) Teachers of lower level courses had lower ratings than did those of more advanced courses, (2) Teachers with a class load of 30-39 students had lower ratings than did instructors with fewer students, (3) Instructors and assistant professors received lower ratings than did associate professors and professors, (4) Off-campus instructors received higher ratings than on-campus instructors, (5) Teachers of elective courses had higher ratings than did instructors of required courses.

Goode, Delmer M. "Evaluation and Teaching." In Evaluation of Teaching and Teachers. Journal of Dental Education, 30, 1967, pp. 260-264.

Emphasizes that a profession, such as dentistry, can exist only if it rests on a theory or technology. Evaluation is an ongoing process of identifying and defining values. Visitation, testing procedures, and appraisal by students must be utilized in evaluative techniques.

_____. 72 College Teaching Procedures. 2nd edition. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 1966.

Briefly describes seventy-two procedures for increasing the effectiveness of college teaching. These procedures strengthen teacher competence and therefore provide the instructor with better ratings in evaluation.

Guild, Robert. "Criterion Problem in Instructor Evaluation." In Evaluation of Teaching and Teachers. Journal of Dental Education, 30, 1967, pp. 270-279.

The article takes the position that the common need, in measurement, is the existence of a criterion (standard, touchstone, benchmark) with which the to-be-measured phenomenon is compared. Criteria that could be used for the evaluation of dental instructors could be formulated under the headings of:

1. Code of instructional ethics,
2. Position description,
   a. significant working relations with others,
   b. specific work,
   c. job knowledge,
   d. technical knowledge of teaching and learning,

3. Student opinion, and
4. Student achievement.

Gustad, John W. "Evaluation of Teaching Performance: Issues and Possibilities." Improving College Teaching. Edited by Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967, pp. 265-281.

The report indicates major trends as exemplified by comparative analysis of the 1961, and 1966, surveys conducted by the American Council on Education. These trends indicate:

1. Decline in the use of systematic student ratings;
2. Decline in classroom visitation;
3. Greater utilization of committee evaluation;
4. Greater analysis of grade distributions;
5. Wide use of informal student opinions, and evaluation by deans and chairmen;
6. Almost total absence of research on the validity of the instruments used.

_____. "Policies and Practices in Faculty Evaluation." Committee on College Teaching of the American Council on Education, July, 1961.

The investigation surveyed the evaluation practices in use of the collegiate members of the American Council on Education. Liberal Arts Colleges (272), Private Universities (68), State Universities (62), State and Municipal Colleges (90), Teachers Colleges (29), Junior Colleges (25), and Professional and Technical Institutions (38) were the types of the 584 institutions surveyed. In the large majority of institutions, those principally responsible for evaluation are the president, the dean, and the department (or division) chairman. Committee involvement was mentioned to a small extent. Of the factors considered in making evaluations, without exception, all seven types of institutions said that classroom teaching was the most important factor in evaluation. Others mentioned in order were other types, personal attributes, student advising, research, publication, committee work, professional society activity, length of service in rank, public service, supervision of graduate study, consultation, competing offers, and supervision of honors.

Six sources of data for evaluating classroom teaching appear to be the most heavily utilized; these are: (1) informal student opinion, (2) formal student opinion (student ratings), (3) classroom visitation, (4) colleagues' opinions, and (5) the opinions of chairmen and deans.

The predominant bases for the evaluation of research and publication are the opinions of colleagues, chairmen, and deans. More frequently mentioned than any of these three was the faculty résumé. At least one-half of the institutions responding stated that they were dissatisfied with the present evaluation policies.

Hatch, Winslow R., and Bennet, Ann. "Effectiveness in Teaching." New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 2. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

This publication provides studies in various areas of teacher effectiveness. New research on the effectiveness of teaching suggests:

1. That class size is not the critical factor, it is the nature of teaching as it affects learning.
2. That one method is not more effective than another.
3. That problem-oriented approaches are becoming more effective.

Hilgert, Raymond L. "Teacher or Researcher?" The Educational Forum, 28 (May, 1964), pp. 463-468.

Through investigation of research and publications in this area, the author states that those who insist that a professor's first interest should be teaching argue the following points: (1) degree, research, or publications does not guarantee a person will be an effective teacher; (2) knowledge of the subject is secondary, the ability to impart knowledge to the student is primary; (3) promotions and salary increases should be based first of all on the professor's competence as a teacher.

Those who favor research and writing offer the following points: (1) research and writing reinforce the teaching efforts; (2) students consider the professors knowledge to be relatively authorative when the professor has published a substantial amount; (3) research and writing serve as modes of preparation for classroom presentation; (4) research updates teaching; (5) professors should be speaking out in today's troubled world. The answer to the problem remains a matter of individual choice.

"Improving College Teaching." (Editorial) School and Society, 95 (Summer, 1968), pp. 271-272.

The article states that the University of Colorado School of Education is providing for professors to meet with Homer C. Rainey, professor emeritus of higher education. Dr. Rainey

will meet with one or two teachers a day to discuss their particular teaching problems. A one-a-month seminar will also be provided to facilitate discussion in this area.

Isaacson, Robert L., et al. "Correlation of Teacher Personality Variables and Student Ratings." Journal of Educational Psychology, 54 (1963), pp. 110-117.

Five personality factors--surgency, agreeableness, dependability, emotional stability, and culture--are generally described as relevant traits to teaching. The purpose was to determine whether these personality traits can correlate with effective college teaching. The only high correlation achieved (0.48) was between the peer rating of culture and student ratings of effectiveness.

Kent, Laura. "Student Evaluation of Teaching." The Educational Record, 47 (Summer, 1966), pp. 376-406.

The American Council on Education Survey of 1966 provided a great deal of information on evaluation by students. One institution in ten said that systematic student ratings are used in all or most departments. The systematic student rating is not used at all in 47.6 percent of the institutions surveyed. Those who have seriously examined the question of student evaluation feel that students are very perceptive and that ratings are not affected by such factors as rater's sex, class size, rater's grade-point average, or teacher's sex. Students do tend to be overly lenient in their ratings, particularly in cases where the administration conducts the program and requires evaluation of all its faculty members.

Langen, Thomas D. F. "Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness." Improving College and University Teaching, XIV (Winter, 1966), pp. 22-25.

The article states that forty-three years of assessing student opinion of teaching at the University of Washington has resulted in the current survey form of ten items. Analyses of these forms indicate that there is no relationship between the rating received by the instructor and the grade the student expects to receive from the course. System of rating has merit, but the same items should not be used for all disciplines and for all levels of instruction.

Laurits, James. "Thoughts on the Evaluation of Teaching." The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Pi Lambda Theta, 1967, pp. 32-42.

Discusses some of the problems associated with evaluation at various levels. Explains that the school has a responsibility to the student. The main burden of the evaluation of teaching must rest with the teachers--the process must become a part of the teaching process itself. Model schools or pilot institutions can be designated to study evaluation methods and procedures.

Lehmann, Irvin J. "Evaluation of Instruction." Evaluation in Higher Education (Paul Dressel editor). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961, pp. 330-359.

Discussion of points dealing with the evaluation of teaching and the teacher. The teacher has some valid prejudices with respect that a list of specific suggestions on teaching aids will not necessarily improve the degree of instruction or learning. More appraisal of individuals before hiring is needed. Abolishment of the practice of talking about teaching and paying for something else is needed. Added attention needs to be focused on increased experimentation with instructional processes and greater appraisal of how teaching affects students.

Lewis, Edwin C. "An Investigation of Student-Teacher Interaction as a Determiner of Effective Teaching." Journal of Educational Research, 57 (March, 1964), pp. 360-363.

The purpose of the investigation was to determine whether students and teachers tend to interact along measurable personality dimensions. Three groups of students were chosen; the first two groups provided a control of sex (male) and variation of subject matter, while the third group provided a variation of sex. Each student, as well as selected instructors in the various subject-matter fields, completed two questionnaires--The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and a one hundred item biographical inventory. The results did not support the hypothesis. It was also concluded that effective teachers cannot be differentiated from less effective teachers on the basis of personality variables.

Locksley, Norman. "A Mathematical Look at [illegible]uation of Teaching." School Science and Mathematics, L[illegible] II ([illegible]), pp. 797-798.

The purpose of this experiment was to s[illegible]ow difficult it would be to mathematically develop some exac[illegible]sure of teaching performance. What the observer hopes [illegible] is evaluating --

Teaching Performance--is actually the sum of: teaching ability; environmental influence on teaching; bias toward the person; bias toward the field; two random errors--errors in teaching performance, and errors in observation. The author concluded that the problems of evaluation seem to be a lot more complex than any formula could encompass.

Lundstedt, Sven. "Criteria for Effective Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, 14 (Winter, 1966), pp. 27-31.

Discusses the point that teaching is basically communication. Criteria essential to good teaching and related to communication are: knowledge of one's subject matter, empathy, and sense of timing. Proper timing is the most difficult to achieve in class. The effective communicator is generally the effective teacher.

Manual on the Explanation of Merit Rating System Rating Information Form, New Mexico State University, September 19, 1966.

New Mexico State University grants salary increases on a merit basis. Each faculty member fills out a form each year. The evaluation is based on three kinds of contribution: Teaching, Research and/or Creative Scholarship, and Professional Service. The assigned duty load should be considered in the final rating. It is the hypothesis that excellent teaching cannot be validly rated by tests, student rating forms, or any known device. Similarly, value of publications cannot be rated by number, page counts, or even number of times cited as a reference. Therefore, these evaluations must depend upon man's honest evaluation of man. The department head and others concerned must make judgements to the best of their ability using all the information at their command. Factors considered in evaluating teaching are:

(1) Knowledge of subject matter
(2) Organization of material
(3) Attitude toward students
(4) Attitude toward teaching

Points considered in connection with research and/or creative scholarship are:

(1) Preparation
(2) Planning and execution
(3) Results
(4) Direction of graduate students

Factors considered in evaluation of professional service are:

(1) Service with students
(2) Committee work--department, college and university
(3) Off-campus professional work

Department heads study the information form, confer with the faculty member concerning strengths and weaknesses, confer with the appropriate dean, and assign a rating.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "A Tissue Committee for Teachers." Improving College and University Teaching, 15 (Winter, 1967), pp. 5-10.

Relates that most professions have evolved ways in which the effectiveness of practice can be judged (i.e. pathological tissue committee in medicine). Only the professional act of college teaching seems to have exempted itself from any kind of realistic assessment. The evaluation process consists of first formulating broad educational purposes or objectives, then specifying them into discrete behavioral terms, then seeking appropriate relevant learning experiences, then accumulating evidence of successful or unsuccessful demonstration of desired behaviors, and finally making judgements as to whether or not the broad educational objectives have been achieved.

There are only four reasonable sources for evidence concerning teaching. Any systematic program of evaluation must find ways to sample each of them. The first is the teacher himself. The second source is the person who has actually received the instruction: the student. A third source would be the observations of someone who has seen teaching in progress. The fourth would be demonstrations of behaviors which the teaching was intended to modify. Evidence from several areas should be routinely collected for each faculty member.

Megaw, Neill. "The Dynamics of Evaluation." University of Kentucky College of Dentistry Conference on Evaluation of Teaching and Teachers, 1967. (Pre-Conference Readings), pp. 30-34.

Contains opinion on the advantages and disadvantages of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Further statements regard the present methods of objective evaluation as so ineffective that the only solution may well be total subjective evaluation by committee.

Morton, Richard K. "Evaluating College Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, IX (Summer, 1961), pp. 122-123.

The author comments on various types of evaluation. Student evaluations, though limitations and faults exist, can be quite helpful. Improvisations can also take place, such as the students' verbally discussing the good and the bad at the last class period or a selected group of students' writing a critique.

Administrative visitation evaluation should be done on more than one occasion and the evaluator should be supplied with course outline and be briefed in advance of the visit on content, purposes, and procedures of the course.

_____. "Student Views of Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, XIII (Summer, 1965), pp. 140-142.

The author feels that student evaluation of teachers is useful to the university administration, particularly to the academic dean, if they are used, along with other data, in evaluating a teacher's professional competence and teaching effectiveness in any given course and with a specific class. Proper allowance must be made for misinterpretation and possible frivolous or vindictive use by students. The more mature students, regardless of their class standing have a greater ability for interpreting teacher effectiveness than less mature students.

Musella, Donald, and Rusch, Reuben. "Student Opinion on College Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, XVI (Spring, 1968), pp. 137-140.

The purposes of a study conducted at the State University of New York at Albany were: (1) to identify university professors who are considered by students to improve thinking; (2) to obtain student opinion concerning (a) teacher behaviors that promote thinking, (b) teacher behaviors and characteristics associated with effective teaching in general, and (c) teacher behaviors and characteristics associated with effective teaching with respect to specific academic fields.

Analysis of the 394 student questionnaires returned indicated that the teaching behaviors which most promote thinking, in order of importance, were:

(1) attitudes toward subject
(2) attitudes toward students
(3) effective use of questions
(4) speaking ability
(5) knowledge of subject
(6) organization of subject matter
(7) extensive and effective use of discussion

Expert knowledge of subject was chosen frequently by students as an important characteristic associated with effective teaching in general. Systematic organization of subject matter and ability to explain clearly were among the top three behaviors in the physical and biological sciences, but ability to encourage thought and enthusiastic attitude toward subject were among the top three for the arts and social sciences.

Newell, Donald. "Evaluation of Teachers." University of Kentucky College of Dentistry Conference on Evaluation of Teaching and Teachers, 1967. (Pre-Conference Readings), pp. 48-54.

Presentation of previous findings on student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Previous studies involve areas of how ratings were obtained, are students qualified, how dental students perceive their training, etc. Conclusions indicate:

(1) students are fairly good raters of their teachers
(2) class size often affects ratings
(3) only slight differences are evident in ratings from students from required and elective courses
(4) students judge class procedures better than over-all teaching ability
(5) in ranking instructors, degrees make a difference
(6) the quality of teaching in dental schools is good, but the need for improvement warrants serious consideration

Ozmon, Howard. "Publications and Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Spring, 1967), pp. 106-107.

The author suggests that all faculties, college and university, be divided not only into departments, but into two distinct sections within departments. One section for those who teach, and the other for those who do research and publishing, giving equal status to each, since one is no more important than the other. Thus a good teacher could go up the ranks to become a full professor, even though he had published nothing. The author also states that teacher self-evaluation is faulty, more weight should be placed on evaluation by students, faculty should be allowed to judge fellow staff members, and that administrators need to be more energetic in evaluating teachers.

Phillips, Beeman N. "The 'Individual' and the 'Classroom Group' as Frames of Reference in Determining Teacher Effectiveness." Journal of Educational Research, 58 (November, 1964), pp. 128-131.

The purpose of the study was to test the hypothesis that teaching effectiveness, determined by the uniform application of criteria, is different from teaching effectiveness determined by selective application of criteria. In other words, teacher effectiveness is measured by the extent to which what happens in the class agrees with what the student wants. Results indicated that students favored a highly structured class with "highly visible" tests over a highly motivating class with a strong emphasis on personal warmth. Additional

evidence indicated that student characteristics play a crucial role in the perception of teacher effectiveness.

Pogue, Jr., F. G. "Students' Ratings of the 'Ideal Teacher.'" Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Spring, 1967), pp. 133-136.

The professor evaluation form prepared by Quick and Wolf at the University of Oregon was used to determine the 'ideal professor' at Philander Smith College. Forty-six percent (307 students) of the total college enrollment was polled. Characteristics listed as most important were: (1) good knowledge of subject (40.7%), (2) a good evaluator (14.0%), (3) explains clearly (12.0%). Characteristics of the ideal teacher listed as least important were: (1) is scholarly and participates actively in research (30.9%), (2) likes college age youth (22.7%), (3) encourages independent thinking (6.5%), (4) has adequate and well modulated voice (11.4%).

"Projected System for Publishing Ratings of Teachers." Memorandum, University of Oregon.

After studying the problem of whether a system could be devised for publishing and distributing student ratings of a teacher against his will, the University made the following resolution:

> Systematic survey of student reaction to courses and instruction at the university would be welcomed and faculty assistance would be provided if requested. Furthermore any evaluation may be published against the will of any faculty member, provided the faculty member states his position before publication time.

Punke, Harold H. "Improvement in College Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, XIII (Summer, 1965), pp. 159-161.

The author feels that as much objectivity as possible must be included in evaluation. Personal observations, interviews, opinionaires, analysis of learned judgments, and similar evaluative devices are most helpful when they lean toward the overall objective, and are used in relation to items listed on a point scale. The aims of a course, facilities, and conditions must be carefully considered in evaluative efforts.

Renner, Richard R. "A Successful Rating Scale." Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Winter, 1967), pp. 12-14.

Those who really know the instructor best are his students. They are the ultimate consumers of his efforts, and are the only ones who know whether he has been effective or not. They are not trained judges of the suitability of their mentor's methods. But they do judge whether or not the course had value for them. Although their reactions are obviously not the only index of teacher competence, they appear to be the ones most sharply focused on teaching itself, both the content and the process. A college administrator will evaluate teaching largely on the basis of casual reports from students and faculty members. With these factors in mind, the author devised a faculty-approved rating scale.

Rovin, Sheldon. (ed.). "Evaluation of Teaching and Teachers." Proceedings of the University of Kentucky College of Dentistry Faculty Conference, June, 1967.

Discussion and reports on evaluation. Areas of discussion were student evaluation, peer evaluation, administration evaluation, alumni evaluation, self-evaluation, and other comments. Examination of reports in the various areas indicate the following:

(1) Evaluation by students
   a. Student evaluation of subject-matter competency should be viewed with caution
   b. Pedagogical skills are evaluated by students more easily than subject-matter competency
   c. Professional attitudes and habits are the easiest areas for students to observe (relevance is questioned)

(2) Evaluation by peers
   a. Voluntary selection of peers was mentioned
   b. Secrecy was deplored
   c. Objectives of the technique were questioned
   d. The need of provisions to inform the administration of inadequate department chairmen was discussed

(3) Administration evaluation
   a. A system of assistance and correction is needed instead of simply reward or punishment
   b. The department chairman plays a critical role. His role was, and must be, defined
   c. The dean should serve as appellate authority

(4) Alumni evaluation
   a. The utilization of conferences and questionnaires were explored

(5) Self-evaluation
   a. A conscious process that should be utilized continuously
   b. It should not be used, by itself, to justify monetary or academic rank advancements.

Samalonis, Bernice. "Ratings By Students." Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Winter, 1967), p. 11.

It is the author's contention that student ratings should be available as a basis for faculty advancement. College professors should not turn their backs on student ratings. It is time we questioned the system. Student evaluation is not a threat to our vested interests, but a means of improving the evaluation of professors in a rapidly developing educational institution. Instructors should not be rated when they are teaching classes in which they do not have the background, or classes they have not had the opportunity to plan for the course.

Schwartz, Richard. "Student Power--In Response to the Questions." The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change, Background papers for Participants, 1968 Annual Meeting American Council on Education, 1968, pp. 96-107.

Much of the student criticism about the classroom reflects discontent with the style of teaching rather than the content of the particular courses. Dull lectures, perfunctory examinations, papers graded without substantive comment, lack of classroom discussion, inaccessability of the professor, all of these rank much higher on the list of student gripes than complaints of curriculum content. Student Course Teacher Evaluations are more critiques for teaching than they are proposals for curricular revision. The medium outweighs the message. Students are competent judges of good and bad lectures, adequate and inadequate discussions, helpful and efficient comments on papers.

Shane, Harold G. "How Do They Rate You, Professor?" National Education Association Journal, 54 (November, 1965), pp. 18-22.

Discussion of comments by over 300 students from some twenty-one colleges and universities. In compiling these conversations on evaluation, the author selected individuals that had completed at least two or more years of study.

Shoben, Jr., Joseph Edward. "Gimmicks and Concepts in the Assessment of Teaching." Improving College Teaching, (Calvin B. T. Lee editor), Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967, pp. 292-295.

The author discusses three propositions that must be considered when discussing teacher evaluation. These propositions are:

(1) Teaching is hard to evaluate because of the lack of conceptual framework. Analytic thought should be encouraged.

(2) The jargon of the computer engineers GIGO (garbage in, garbage out) may be worth heeding in respect to teacher evaluation. This means simply that inadequate information is fed in, and comparably inadequate answers come out.

(3) Goals to improve teaching may be attained more readily if an effort to reformulate teaching is undertaken as an intellectually interesting problem.

Shrock, John G. "Student Evaluation of Instruction." Manual, Fifth Annual Faculty Conference, University of Illinois College of Dentistry, 1964, pp. 75-93.

Provides a description of processes and methods pertaining to student evaluation of instruction at the University of California School of Dentistry. Experimentation with the evaluation results is undertaken to develop improvement of instruction, for curriculum planning, and as a means of communication among students, faculty, and the administration. Processes and methods include:

(1) Student-Faculty Liaison Committee
(2) Rating scale for lecture course
(3) Rating scale for clinical/lab instructors
(4) Application of results (letter of commendation, feedback to instructors, dean functions as counselor)
(5) Validity of student appraisal (does improvement result)

Simpson, Ray H., and Seidman, Jerome M. Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1962.

Provides a large number and a great variety of types of evaluative items. The assumption is to provide the means so the instructor can devise his own evaluative tool.

_____. "Use of Teacher Self-Evaluative Tools for the Improvement of Instruction." Improvement of Instruction in Higher Education, Report to The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1962, pp. 49-62.

A list of seventeen Teacher Self-Evaluation Tools was prepared and distributed to AACTE Institutional Representatives of the 487 member institutions. Increased interest and requests for the questionnairewerethe reason for the 5,303 questionnaires available for analysis. The highest ranking approach was the "comparative check on your efficiency using one teaching approach vs. your efficiency using another approach." However, the item with the highest success ratio was the "voluntary and continuing colleague discussions or seminars by instructors of a particular course." Conclusions drawn as a result of the study were:

(1) The tools judged most successful for self-evaluation are teacher oriented in terms of information gathering rather than student oriented.
(2) Lack of knowledge of how to go about self-evaluation is a restraining factor.
(3) The use of self-evaluative tools is dependent upon the subject-matter field involved.
(4) An extremely small fraction of college instructors react almost violently to any self-evaluation proposal.

Smart, Russell C. The Evaluation of Teaching Performance from the Point of View of the Teaching Profession. (A paper presented to the American Psychological Association Meeting.) Chicago: September 5, 1965.

This paper presented various positions, principles, and committee reports of the American Association of University Professors. In reviewing the work of the AAUP, it was stated that no committee had yet been formulated to study evaluation procedures specifically. Previous association statements reflect that the matter of freedom of teaching has to do primarily with the selection of topics to be covered in a given course. Evaluation of the instruction provided for students may be done by the college administration, but is better done by colleagues. They are in a better position to judge the dignity, courtesy and temperateness of language, the patience, considerateness and pedagogical wisdom which he uses.

Spaights, Ernest. "Students Appraise Teachers' Methods and Attitudes." Improving College and University Teaching, XV (Winter, 1967), pp. 15-17.

The investigation sought to answer two questions: (1) Do high achieving students have more favorable perceptions of instruc-

tors' teaching methods than low achieving students? (2) Do high achieving students view the personal attitudes of college instructors more favorably than low achieving students? Two samples totaling 293 students were examined. The high-achiever group consisted of students witha mean grade-point average of 2.89 (4.00 system). The range was from 3.74 to 2.45. The mean grade-point average of the low-achiever group was 1.96, with a range of 1.04 to 2.41. Results indicated that students with both high and low grade-point averages thought there was too much emphasis on the lecture method. Both groups agreed that there was a general lack of independent study. The LA group felt that too much emphasis was being placed on mastery of the textbook. More above average students were in favor of greater use of audio-visual aids than were below average students. Above average students wanted more essay examinations. The majority of the LA students perceived the typical college instructor as being impersonal, dictatorial, sarcastic, and lacking enthusiasm in his work. Not many HA students saw instructors as having many undersirable personality traits.

Stewart, Clifford T., and Malpass, Leslie F. "Estimates of Achievement and Ratings of Instructors." Journal of Educational Research, 59 (April, 1966), pp. 347-350.

The article states results of a study in which a Course and Instructor Information Form was administered by sixty-seven instructors teaching fifty-four courses to 1,975 students. Analysis of the questionnaires showed that of the 1,975 students sampled, those expecting higher grades graded their instructors significantly higher than did students expecting low grades. Freshmen viewed grading policies more favorably than did the upperclass students. Further analysis indicated that instructors should consider reducing the complexity of their classroom presentation for freshmen, and increasing the sophistication of their presentation for upper classmen.

Van Waes, Robert. "Student Freedoms and Educational Reform." Stress and Campus Response; Current Issues in Higher Education, 1968. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968. pp. 73-76.

It is the opinion of the author that we need to listen to student complaints to determine the sources of their frustration and dissatisfaction. Students object to curriculum; they wish relevance, commitment and leverage. They object to teaching methods. They reject "canned knowledge," "packaged formulae," "learning by fiat,"

and the lack of "genuine" dialog. If students can criticize and actually share in the governance of our colleges, then they and we will have an opportunity to confront institutional problems in a context that will be both less dramatic and less explosive, but probably more fruitful.

Werdell, Philip. Course and Teacher Evaluation. 2nd. ed. Washington, D.C.: United States National Student Association, 1966.

Describes various methods dealing with course and teacher evaluation. Among this material are evaluation forms, questionnaires, discussions, and positions.

Winthrop, Henry. "Worth of a Colleague." Improving College and University Teaching, XIV (Autumn, 1966), pp. 262-264.

The process of academic freedom or academic democracy illustrates the academic 'escape from freedom' or sell-out which is currently taking place. In the evaluation of teaching, where colleague opinion is taken into consideration, the majority can label the non-conformist or aggressive teacher as incompetent and convince the administration to take action. Schclarship and publication are often evaluated by peer approval. A reputable scholar may find his work judged to be of poor quality by his colleagues when he is a member of a minority within a department.

Much of the judging of a colleague's worth takes place behind the scenes. Decision-makers in an administrative hierarchy will frequently avoid a confrontation between the faculty members being judged and his judging peers.

Woodring, Paul. "Must College Teachers Publish or Perish." Educational Digest, 30 (September, 1964), pp. 35-37.

Many college presidents say that good teaching is the first consideration in most institutions for retaining college teachers. However, this usually is on the basis of publication and not teaching. One reason for the emphasis on publications is that the prestige of the university rests on the publications of the faculty. Administrative personnel, as well as department chairmen, have little knowledge of their faculty's teaching competencies and through long tradition they seldom visit classrooms. However, they can read a man's publications. A balanced faculty is needed; a faculty that will have both types of individuals--those interested in teaching and those interested in research. However, there is no completely

objective way of evaluating either research or teaching. And whichever criteria is used, the decision of promotions must be made on the subjective judgements. Errors will occur, but the decisions must be made.

The Following Sources Have Been Found to Be Unappropriate to This Topic or Unavailable for Examination.

"Anatomy of Professionalism." Clearing House, 41 (May, 1967), pp. 515-519.

Astin, Alexander W. "Classroom Environment in Different Fields of Study." Journal of Educational Psychology, 56, 1965, pp. 275-283.

Brickman, William W. "Student Evaluation of Professors." School and Society, 94 (March 19, 1966), pp. 143-144.*

Byrnes, Robert F. "Our First Need: Improved Teaching." The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 51 (May, 1967), pp. 132-143.

Coswell, Hollis L. "The Nature of Good Teaching." School and Society, 88 (December 3, 1960), pp. 459-461.

Davis, Hazel. "What Teachers Say About Evaluation of Teachers." National Education Association Journal, 54 (February, 1965) pp. 37-39.

Eckert, R. E., and Neale, D. C. "Teachers and Teaching." Review of Educational Research, 35, 1965, pp. 304-317.

Ederer, Rupert J. "The Poor Professor." The Commonwealth, 73 (October, 1960), pp. 34-36.

"Evaluation: Is Your Infallibility Showing?" Canadian Education and Research Digest, V (December, 1965), pp. 297-308.*

"Evaluation of Classroom Teachers." School Executive, 30 (April, 1965), pp. 22-24.

"Evaluation: The Golden Fleece." The New York State Educator, 55 (January, 1968), pp. 42-43.*

Fattu, Nicholas A. "Teacher Effectiveness." National Education Association Journal, 50 (October, 1961), pp. 55-56.

Freehill, Maurice F. "Authoritarian Bias and Evaluation of College Experiences." Improving College and University Teaching, 15 (Winter, 1967), pp. 18-19.

"From Logs to Logistics." School and Society, 95 (November 11, 1967), pp. 420-423.*

Goode, Delmer M. "The Centrality of Evaluation." In College and University Teaching. W. C. Brown Company, 1964,, pp. 503-508.*

Hain, John H., and Smith, George J. "How Principals Rate Teachers." The American School Board Journal, 155 (February, 1968), pp. 16-18.

Hall, Vernon C. "Former Students' Evaluation as a Criterion for Teaching Success." Journal of Experimental Education, 34 (Fall, 1965), pp. 1-19.

Hayes, Robert Bennett. "A Measure of Student Attitude Toward Teaching Effectiveness." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University, 1961.*

Howsam, R. B. "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore." School Executive, 29 (March, 1964), pp. 12-15.

Hudiburg, G. E. "The Relationship of Degrees Held by College Instructors and Teaching Effectiveness." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Arkansas, 1965.*

"Issues in University Governance." Institute of Higher Education, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, September, 1968.

Martin, Harold. "A Third Are Unfit." Senior Scholastic, 77 (January 25, 1961), p. 1T.

"Merit Pay Plan." Senior Scholastic (Editorial), 77 (November 9, 1960), p. 1T.

"Merit Pay Should Rate, Not Rank." Nations Schools, 80 (November, 1967), p. 46.*

"Methods of Evaluating Teachers." Educational Digest, 31 (September, 1965), pp. 22-24.

Morgo. "Science, Education and Evaluation." Adult Leadership, 16 (March, 1968), pp. 333-334.

"News and Trends; Evaluation of Classroom Teachers." Educational Leadership, 22 (May, 1965), p. 623.

"New Style in Administration? Faculty Evaluation of Administrators." Junior College Journal, 38 (September, 1967), pp. 22-23.*

"Profile of the Good Teacher." School and Society (Editorial), 88 (November 5, 1960), p. 424.

"Publications and Academic Merit." Modern Language Journal, 51 (November, 1967), pp. 391-394.*

"Rating Teachers and Aids." Young Children, 22 (November, 1967), pp. 381-384.*

Ryans, David G. "Studies of Teacher Traits." Science News Letter, 78 (November 19, 1960), p. 326.

"Score Card for Rating Teacher Performance." The Clearing House, 42 (January, 1968), p. 287. *

Steffensen, James P. "Teacher Evaluation and Salary Policy." School Life, 44 (October, 1961), pp. 22-24.

"Students to Assess Faculty." Times Educational Supplement, 2632 (October 29, 1965), p. 893.*

"Substandard College Staffs." School and Society (Editorial), 89 (October 7, 1961), p. 315.

Taylor, Bob L. "Upgrading Teaching." Senior Scholastic, 78 (February 15, 1961), p. 1T.

"Teacher Evaluation." Saturday Review, 45 (July 21, 1961), p. 47.*

"Teaching and Teacher Responsibility." The Junior College Journal 38 (March, 1968), pp. 48-50.

"Ten Commandments of Good Teaching." The Illinois Educator, 55 (May, 1967), p. 407.

"Unique Quality of Great Teaching." The Kentucky School Journal, 46 (November, 1967), pp. 17-20.*

"Views of Teacher Evaluation." New York State Education, 53 (March, 1966), pp. 14-21.*

"Workshop: Evaluating Staff Performance." School Management, 11 (June, 1967), p. 15.*

* — Sources unavailable for examination (missing from stacks, etc.).